



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CURRENT INTEREST IN THE CRUCIFIXION.

By PROFESSOR CHARLES GRAY SHAW, PH.D.,
New York University, New York City.

"THE problem, which has recently been solved, concerning the 'sweat' of Jesus Christ has troubled Paris profoundly and with it France." These words are subjoined, by the editor of *La Revue*, to an article by Dr. Cabanes on the "Death of Jesus in the Light of Contemporary Science;"¹ and, with this article, they reflect some of the interest which has been aroused by the holy shroud discussions. From a physiological point of view, Dr. Cabanes raises the question whether crucifixion, as ordinarily inflicted, was calculated to cause death; and if so, how much time was usually necessary for this result to follow. In the particular case of Jesus Christ, it is further inquired whether death might have been due to exhaustion, to instantaneous rupture of the heart, or to a wound which may have penetrated to the pericardium. Dr. Cabanes's conclusion is that such wounds as Christ received (his legs were not broken like the thieves') were not sufficient to kill; that the length of time involved in the crucifixion was not great enough to cause death, which was only an apparent expiration.

German interest has perhaps been evinced by a contribution from the pen of Richard Mansberg, who writes from the historical standpoint. This writer makes valuable researches among ancient methods of execution and compares death at the stake with that on the cross. Among various kinds of execution, crucifixion seems to have been the worst form possible. Mansberg raises various questions—as to the form of the cross, whether the crucified one was naked or clothed, how the removal from the cross was effected. In commenting on the simplicity and universality of the crucifixion narrative in the gospels, he

¹ CABANES, "La mort de Jésus devant la science contemporaine," *La Revue*, May, 1902.

expresses himself as desiring to fill in the details of "that frightful drama on Golgotha which forms the most significant chapter in the history of humanity."

As an evolutionary force, the crucifixion has further been regarded. W. W. Peyton² links the crucifixion of Christ with the discovery of a new religious force in the realm of the supernatural. In nature death is a most significant feature; in the career of Christ it was the glorious transformation of the kernel of wheat. Thus viewed, the crucifixion becomes an essential part of an evolving nature. Christ's message was a gospel of death as part of the natural order; his crucifixion became a life-force relating man to God. In this way English thought, which fifty years ago gave us evolution, now seeks to apply this to the phenomena of Golgotha.

Tolstoi's peculiar meditation on the crucifixion may also be cited:

The thief on the cross believed in the Christ, and was saved. Like the thief on the cross, I believe in the doctrine of Jesus, and this belief has made me whole. Like the thief, I knew that my past and present life was vile; I saw that the majority of men about me lived unworthy lives. I knew, like the thief, that I was wretched and suffering, and I saw before me nothing but death to save me from this condition. As the thief saw before him, after the suffering of a foolish life, the horrible shadows of death, so I beheld the same vista opening before me. In all this, I felt that I was like the thief. There was, however, a difference in our conditions: he was about to die, and I—I still lived. The dying thief thought perhaps to find his salvation beyond the grave, while I had before me life and its mystery this side the grave. I understood nothing of this life; it seemed to me a frightful thing, and then—I understood the words of Jesus, and life and death ceased to be evil; instead of despair, I tasted joy and happiness that death could not take away.³

Thus in recent times interest in the death of Christ has been manifold; yet it remains to be shown how this most significant event relates itself to the course of positive religion. Art and common life, theology and Christian conduct, have not for a moment hesitated to draw inspiration from the cross; but the position which this object assumes in history has not been indicated. Here philosophy of religion must arouse itself. The

² *Contemporary Review*, April, 1900.

³ TOLSTOI, *My Religion*, Intro.

death of Christ has, then, a historical significance, and this is seen more clearly when, narrowing the field of our attention to the New Testament period, we endeavor to discern the inner meaning of that which then came to pass. In itself, the historical point of view deserves recognition, and when once theology has adopted it, much light will gather upon the problem of the atonement.

1. Current theology, like current philosophy, suffers from subjectivism. The one falls back upon feeling; the other, upon psychology. Theology can certainly profit by consulting, to some extent, the principles which guide conscious life; but with the merely psychological interest it cannot remain content. From such subjectivism the idea of the atonement may be saved by working well into the historical situation of the New Testament. Let the historical, then, be emphasized. Christ by dying saves mankind. Such is the obvious New Testament fact; how this salvation is brought about theology must decide, if decide it can. But Christ, who is the Redeemer, and man, who is saved by his death, are historical creatures, having their position within the realm of time and space. It is thus that the historical consideration is forced upon theological thought. Ultimately it may be shown that Christ, like the ancient Melchizedek, was "without beginning or end of days;" and that man, being saved, inherits eternal life. But the point of living contact between the soul and its Savior is to be found in the historical process. Theology can only gain by the recognition of this fact; and then, in accepting its conditions of psychological religion, it can avoid the purely subjective, and can readjust itself to the problem at large. The objective point of view, in the case of the redemption of Christ, is to be found in history. In this way it must be shown what is the essential position which Jesus' death occupies in Christianity. The ethical point of view which sees in the cross a means of religious culture, and the theological method which construes the death of Christ in the form of an atonement, need both of them to return to the historical fact and survey, not an abstract death, but the actual crucifixion of Jesus Christ.

The value of the tragic event cannot be overstated; yet the view of it may be distorted. At the outset it may be said that the death of Christ cannot gain by artificial isolation. To appreciate it, we must observe its connection with the total career of which it was, sadly enough, only the culmination. The life of Christ and his teaching cannot be separated from his work and passion; taken together, they make up a distinct career, of definite religious benefit to mankind. Not as though Christ served the material interests of his day, or the bare intellectual welfare of history, but as completing a work of incomparable worth to all mankind, must he be esteemed. Such a career of service could have but one end, and that was the sacrifice of him who took up this work. Accordingly, Christ's death was the completion of his deed and doctrine.

The crucifixion was the culmination of Christ's career. Herein the true perspective may be found; and to this Christian thought must adjust itself. Theology very naturally desires to appropriate this richest fact in all religious history, full as this fact is of beauty and moral power. But how can theology construct a system of redemption, if it does not survey the death of Christ in its own historical setting? In the records of humanity it is a fact that a great soul suffered death, and under most pathetic circumstances. What shall be thought of him whose life was thus brought to a sad end? Thought must consider the crucifixion as such; for it is upon this realistic fact that the issues of Christian life depend. Like Christian art, theology should find its point of departure in what mankind actually sees in the crucifixion. All this depends upon the appreciation of the historical moment.

History and historical religion bring out the career of Jesus Christ as given in the gospels. When these documents are studied in the light of Christ's doctrine and the effect which this had upon the world, they bring out the fact that, from the outset, the teaching of Jesus was certain to bring about his death. Social conditions, as they then were, were such as to make theological and political teachers natural objects of suspicion; for the age was one of unrest, and very little was needed to

arouse Roman and Judean opposition. If we say that the times were ripe for change in the affairs of human life and history, it must be concluded that any change which might occur could be only an abrupt one. The times were not prepared to receive a world-movement which should attack Jerusalem and threaten Rome; and the world in general, rooted and grounded in inertia, is ready to condemn him who, in bringing out the new, sets at naught the old. It was to be expected that the enormous innovation of Jesus would bring speedy violence upon his head.

Jesus, therefore, was not simply a teacher, delivering a divine message; he was by necessity a person of activity and he performed a definite deed. Yet this was not all; suffering would naturally follow in the wake of his career, and death would be the coronation of his mission. Thus it was that Luke, writing in the Acts of the Apostles, spoke of his gospel as containing all that Jesus began both to do (*ποιεῖν*) and to teach (*διδάσκειν*) and to suffer (*πάσχειν*).⁴ Traditional theology has not succeeded in establishing the relation which holds among these three principles; it has similarly failed to evince the connection between the life and death of Jesus, emphasizing one of these to the exclusion of the other. Conservative theology has usually centered its attention upon the fact of Christ's death, and in so doing it has seized upon that which is most intimate in the aroused and educated religious consciousness of humanity. But the impression which the believer receives is a direct one, whose source is in the New Testament itself; there it is shown how the crucifixion is one of several events in the career of the Redeemer. Christ "suffered under Pontius Pilate;" and it is this vivid historical fact which stands out in the Apostles' Creed. The explanation of Christ's death is to be found in connection with those words and deeds which were so obnoxious to Pilate. The consciousness of Christendom demands the living idea, rather than the abstract conception of Christ's death; and in the feeling of the historical position of the crucifixion it finds a certain fellowship with the sufferings of Christ. Continuity is demanded in the various events which make up all that

⁴Acts I: 1-3.

Jesus accomplished, and in the mind of the believer there must be a definite association of those ideas which reflect the deed, the doctrine, and the death of Christ.

From two distinct quarters there may be noticed the tendency to separate the life of Jesus from his death. On the one side, traditional theology has put practically all of its emphasis upon the death; on the other side, the claims of Christ's life have been urged. The result has been to break up the unity of his mission. The desire of the church has ever been to exalt the crucifixion, because therein is to be found the atonement. On the part of rationalistic thought, the aim has generally been to magnify the life of Christ, his wise teaching and benignant work. Where orthodoxy has spoken of Christ's ministry, it has done so in a brief fashion, without attempting to relate his doctrine and his historical deed to systematic theology. Thus it has failed to measure up to the significance of Christ's life, while yet regarding his death as supreme. Others have begun with the historical career of Jesus, but have halted at the crucifixion. They have considered the death of the Founder of Christianity as the noble end of a martyr. In this way theology has been abrupt in its beginning, starting at once with the Lord's death; rationalism has made an equally brusque termination, concluding as it does with Christ's life.

In addition to these half-views of the larger Christ, there has likewise been the marked tendency to warp the conception by bringing in considerations drawn from jurisprudence and ethics. From the legalistic point of view we cannot measure the meaning of Christ's death, any more than by making use of ethical ideas we can circumscribe his life. The proper standard is to be found in religion, and when one reflects upon the terminology employed in the gospels, he will at once see how difficult it is to invest the language there employed with any other than a religious meaning. A direct view is therefore more than desirable. Then it can be seen that apart from Christ's life his death is incomprehensible; without his death the life is incomplete. Such an inclusive view must be assumed in contemplating the objective Christ of history; just as a similar method must be

employed when Christ is related to man's redemption. It was in this spirit that Paul said: "For if we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, we shall be saved by his life."⁵

2. But, in addition to the general historical setting of the crucifixion, and its particular relation to Christ's life, there must be noted in detail some of the immediate causes of his death. At once it may be said, Jesus was crucified for what he taught as well as for what he did. Both his doctrine and his deed were inimical to Judea and Rome. When, breathing forth his divine message, he said "My Father," the "Jews took up stones to stone him," and they drove him to the cross. When, breaking his stately silence, he announced to Pontius Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world," the ruler gave sentence that he should die. Judean antipathy was aroused by the new doctrine of "God the Father," and here was made a breach with sacerdotalism. Roman supremacy was affected by the conception of the "kingdom." Judea, hating Rome, and Rome, oppressing Judea, joined hands that a mutual enemy might be removed. For Jesus himself the doctrine of the kingdom was a fatal one, and his own cousin, John the Baptist, lost his life for crying out these very tidings.

In the development of Judaism the death of Christ was but the logical outcome of his preaching the message of the fatherhood. This, in the eyes of ecclesiasticism, was an act of blasphemy. The ultimate cause of Christ's death was the theological position which he assumed. When Jesus found himself in the palace of the high priest, he was confronted by his own doctrine of the fatherhood of God and the sonship of Christ. In the presence of Caiaphas he responded only to announce himself as about to sit at the right hand of God. The sacerdotal party, headed by Annas and Caiaphas, was naturally opposed to that innovation which Jesus was projecting, as he taught concerning the heavenly Father. Hereby the great question of religion was affected, and Jesus did not fail to produce unwonted results in this field. He gave a perfectly spiritual conception of God and of man, at once doing away with the vain accessories of sacerdotal worship. These ideas proved fatal to him.

⁵Rom. 5:10.

From Rome's point of view Christ's death seemed warranted by his seemingly seditious teaching of the kingdom of God. It sounded like anarchy, and Christ was spoken of as "a fellow who perverteth the people." Such ideas as Christ's, spread abroad in Galilee and Judea, were obnoxious to Herod and Pontius Pilate, who became easily reconciled to each other and friendly to the priesthood when it was seen how dangerous was the beatitude, "The poor in spirit shall inherit the kingdom of heaven." Religion and rights easily go hand in hand; such has been the testimony of history and reason. When, in the days of Locke and Spinoza, theology and politics were shown to be theoretically separable, it was seen how firm was the actual connection between them; and it was not long afterward, when Hume had shown the social and psychological phase of worship, that religion and sociology presented the same connection in a new form. When Jesus made his enormous innovation in religion, he did not leave human rights unaffected. The emancipation of spiritual life was felt likewise within the precinct of human government. Can we wonder then that Rome, devoid of a healthy sense of justice, and wanting in the appreciation of individual rights, at once responded to the request that Jesus should live no longer?

But these national antipathies were not all, for Jesus encountered various kinds of opposition from the politico-religious parties of his day. Palestine and its people were broken up into many parties of a political character, and as many religious classes. The relation which of necessity Jesus had to assume toward these brought him into disfavor. His Galilean origin and associations embittered the Judeans; his mingling with publicans and Samaritans caused their own reproach in the eyes of the people to fall on him. And what in the way of enmity was not produced by Christ's condemnation of the religious sects? Scribe and Pharisee hated him; Sadducee and Zealot distorted his doctrine. Upon the general question of the religious life and its relation to the world there was more than dispute between Jesus and the parties. Christ's view of human life was unique, and gradually the populace became conscious

that this man from the shores of Gennesaret was bringing about one great cataclysm. Some hailed with holy delight the entrance of an ethical system, which at once set free the human spirit and gave it new aspiration. But the practical side of man's existence was too weighty for many of these disciples, and they could not endure persecution. Only the negative side of Christ's work was noted by those who criticised him. It was because man was to worship neither in Gerizim nor in Jerusalem, because heaven's kingdom was not of this world, because the disciple must hate his life, that they looked askance upon him. The positive, spiritual content, calculated to fill out these old ideas with new meanings, was neglected, and Jesus seemed to be only an iconoclast. Human nature may be dissatisfied, but it is not ready to hate life or reject the world; and man may be restless, but he does not care for catastrophes. Christ's attack upon the earthly life was not pleasant for the Palestinian to contemplate.

Finally, speculative views were set at naught by Jesus, and the results of human thinking seemed now about to be lost. Christ passed judgment upon the world, and his judgment was a negative one. This aroused the opposition of man's æsthetical and philosophical nature. Great minds have at other times made a distinction between the soul and the world; this was certainly the case with Plato. But Plato never felt the sharp and burning antagonism which lies at the foundation of New Testament thought. No; ancient thought believed largely in matter, because it saw in it the symbol of beauty and found in it much satisfaction. Plato could never have said, it profits nothing when one gains the whole world. But Jesus did not hesitate even here, and no wonder that his contemporaries saw in his teaching a decided irony.

What Jesus was doing, in establishing these ideas, was a part of that work which he was destined to perform; but all the while he was making out the case against himself. Judean and Roman, sacerdotal leader and secular partisan, man of the world and philosopher, were all arraying themselves against him and his work. It was the peculiar fate of Jesus that he should die

for his doctrine and his deed. Of course, martyrs have appeared in the world's history up to the dawn of modern times; but great religious characters are not persecuted by their immediate associates. Moses was esteemed a benefactor; Confucius was dear to his people; Gautama found favor in India; and Mohammed was welcomed by the Arabians. But Christ aroused all that was inimical in his generation; and we can hardly wonder at this when we reflect upon his extraordinary doctrine.

3. Yet a more intimate view of Christ's death in its relation to his life may be entertained. History in general, and New Testament history in particular, have felt the force of the crucifixion, but the biography of Jesus himself evinces a more direct point of contact. It was Christ who suffered for his gospel of the kingdom. At last, in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, mankind has awakened to the fact of pain; our biological science and philosophy of pessimism have aided us here. It was not until the days of Kant's philosophy and of Robespierre's politics that the process of feeling in consciousness received the recognition of its independence. Goethe proclaimed that in life there are thirty-six tragic situations. Hahnemann pointed out that there are seventy-three sources of bodily pain. Advanced surgery classifies injuries in the form of a "pentateuch": wounds, tumors, fractures, luxations, and ulcers. The idea, then, which is expressed by the words, "Christ has suffered in the flesh," is a very vivid one, whose impression cannot be forgotten. In the career of Christ, as the Founder of God's kingdom, the crucifixion was the final event. To suffer death was a part of the vast work which he undertook.

The spirit of Jesus during his passion was in harmony with his conduct as the Founder of the kingdom. In the mind of Christ, his death was a dutiful act of suffering, inherently included in his plan; and during the twilight of the walk to Emmaus he asked: "Ought not Christ to suffer these things and to enter into his glory?" Obedience was thus the guiding principle of him who said to his disciples: "I will not henceforth drink of the blood of the grape, till I drink it anew with you in the kingdom of the Father." In his life, when he taught

and wrought as though in the stead of God, he was obedient unto his Father's command; and in his dying the same consciousness was manifest. His crucifixion was climactic, and Christ was "obedient unto death, even the death of the cross."

Paul has mightily shown how the thought of Christ's death can affect the mind of the believer, who, in spirit crucifying the flesh, dies with his Lord. But in the epistle to the Hebrews it is demonstrated how the passion of Jesus, in the anticipation as well as in the actual suffering, was of peculiar influence over him. Through the crucifixion Christ was approved by God as his Son, made manifest to man as his Lord, and perfected in his own character as Redeemer. Such was the divine education of Christ that "he learned obedience by the things which he suffered." By such a process "the captain of salvation was made perfect through suffering." And the result was determined accordingly. "Jesus for the suffering of death was crowned with honor and glory." Thus educated, perfected, and glorified, Christ felt the power of his own death as none other could.

The internal effect of Christ's death cannot be too highly emphasized, and by considering it we can see how important is the connection between the two facts of life and death. In general, theology has found the sonship of Christ to consist in some metaphysical nature or spiritual character; and so far as these indirect methods emphasize the peculiar facts, the mind of Christendom can find value in them. But the direct method of the New Testament goes on to show how intimate was the connection between Christ's history and his character. And in special connection with the crucifixion does this appear; here was the means through which the divine character of Jesus was perfected. For the believer, Jesus, although a historical personage, is yet the possessor of eternal life. But this eternal character becomes Christ's by virtue of his death. By his resurrection from the dead Jesus was declared to be the son of God. The crucifixion, then, becomes the path from the historical to the eternal, and Jesus by his death becomes the Redeemer. Albrecht Dürer said that it was the saddest moment of his life when, quitting Nüremberg for Venice to learn from Mantegna

the secret of his art, he found the great Venetian dead. Yet Jesus by his death loses no power to help man, but rather gains by his cross; without this one element, his career and his doctrine might have been as obscure as that of Philo Judæus.

Accordingly, the person of Jesus as a doctrine cannot be separated from his work. The two interact. In pursuing his peculiar career and unfolding his gospel, Christ developed his divine character. The teaching which he delivered to mankind was calculated, by its heavenly character, to transfigure such a sensitive nature as his; for God's thoughts were being thought after him. The work, performed in response to a divine call, was similarly adapted to bring out the inner character of the Galilean. But greater in its influence than either of these was the passion, by which he learned obedience unto God. Through persecution Christ was brought to see all the more clearly the heavenly character of his message and the divine nature of the kingdom. Rejected by man, he was approved by God; despised by the world, he was loved by the Father, because he laid down his life for the sheep. Christ and his crucifixion are one.

4. The interest which the crucifixion must have for the believer is likely to be a marked one. No individual whose soul has been stirred by the awakening of his religious life can remain indifferent to this event in Christ's career, even though at first he may not know just what the crucifixion may signify. For religious faith which has been educated in the thought of the New Testament nothing can be felt as having greater value than the death of Christ. The soul sees in this a fact, magical in the sentiments which it can arouse. Various may be the feelings created, and a warlike character like Clovis may exclaim, as he learns the tragic story: "O, that I had been there with my Franks!" Yet one constant impression abides. It is this perception on the part of religious consciousness that must be embraced in any theory of the atonement. First the fact, then the theory; first the human, then the divine. The atonement, as a theory, must trace back finally to the consciousness of those who believe in the death of their Lord. As a rule, where metaphysics has been brought in, and jurisprudence as well, psychology has been

overlooked. What is needed to explain the atonement is, not a system of abstract ideas, which are the product of speculation, but living facts, which are the result of experience.

The psychological and historical may be consulted, and thereby theology will become a gainer. Theology has been friendly to other forms of philosophical culture, and has not hesitated at times to make wide departures from its own field, in order to appropriate what had seemed so tempting in another one. Why, then, should it now hesitate to assume as its starting-point, not the abstract intellectualism of a mediævalism which said *Credo, ut intelligam*, but a living consciousness, wherein faith is an instinct? And the appeal which the philosophy of history makes cannot be turned aside. In the case of a particular doctrine like the atonement, why should theology ignore the manifest fact that the crucifixion affects the religious consciousness and produces a peculiar result in history, and yet evince the desire to demonstrate man's redemption by appealing to jurisprudence and ethical theory? Within the field of religious experience and religious history all the advantages of these latter points of view may be found, and that without the ordinary embarrassments of the theories of "moral government" and "satisfaction."

Grotius, mighty in the realm of modern jurisprudence, is well known as a theologian. But, even when we are convinced that in the general idea of divine government there is much value, why should theology embrace the abstract view of natural rights and overlook the kingdom of God? There may be found, first of all, a living, religious idea, having for theology all of the elements of Grotius's famous political theory, and many more besides. Certainly the reader of the New Testament cannot help seeing that in Jesus' mind his death was vitally connected with the idea of the kingdom. For this he died, while all of his disciples fled. Where Paul speaks of the church as having been purchased by the blood of Christ, the same idea may apply, with similar force, to the principle of the kingdom. For, founding it in opposition to Rome, Christ was led to the cross; and for its sake, as a kingdom not of this world, he died. Why, then, can-

not theology find, in the conception of the kingdom, a theory equally as cogent as that of an abstract moral government?

"Satisfaction," as a theory, represents a different theological attitude in Protestant thought. If moral government, as a view, is vitalized by its contact with the idea of the kingdom of God, "satisfaction" will be enriched by being interpreted in connection with Christ's idea of the Fatherhood. Who may be conceived of as having been satisfied by Christ's death? It was he to whom Jesus in Gethsemane said, "Not my will, but thine be done." All the weight of the contrary theory of moral government cannot render unnecessary the idea expressed in the term "satisfaction." God was not indifferent to Christ's behavior, nor was his interest in the crucifixion a purely juristic one. It is plainly to be seen that Jesus desired by his obedience, and determined by the faithful completion of the work assigned him, to satisfy the heavenly Father. Such is the thought of the gospels, especially that of John. These writings, however, do not represent the satisfaction of God as the result of exacting cruelty on the part of a monarch; but rather as the fatherly consideration of one who was well pleased by the obedience of his Son. And, in the larger sense, it may be said that the work of Christ, finished by his death, was a satisfactory one; satisfaction being the complete judgment of God pronounced upon the career of Christ. Perfect in his religious character, and faithful in his divine call as a teacher, Christ produced a complete work.

But, now, how does the crucifixion stand related to the Christian life, with its faith? The relation is there, for the believer clings to the cross; and at once it may be said, that to appropriate the gospel, to believe in God and to live in his kingdom, one must assume a consistent attitude toward Christ, the Master of the whole system. The believer must take him as he is, and must accept the principles of the gospel as they were given. These religious concepts were costly; for them, the Son of man was sacrificed. The world is not divine, but all too human; the power of the world is not heavenly, but of the earth. Hence it was that the principles of Christ were given to us only after a struggle, in which, however, he was more than conqueror.

Therefore, to have God, the believer must find him in Christ, whose death was satisfactory to the Father; to enter the kingdom, the soul must come through Christ, who died that that kingdom might survive.

With especial reference to Christ himself it may be said that Christian faith cannot rest till it rest at last in him who was a crucified Master. To have Christ, one must in some wise accept his character and career; to believe in him, one must regard Christ as the embodiment of eternal life. But all this comes about only when an individual sees in Christ's death the means whereby his personality became what it was, and the method according to which the work was completed. What is to be gained by such a method of reasoning from simple New Testament principles? Chiefly this: the fact of Christ's death, and the appreciation of this in the awakened and educated religious life; in these lies the point of departure for the doctrine of the atonement. No theory can supply the essential and positive element found in the historical crucifixion; nor can any view of his personality be found satisfactory if it does not finally consider Christ in the character of a Redeemer. Deed and doctrine, life and character, have as their vanishing-point the crucifixion. Not until then was Jesus able to say: "It is finished."